

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. 2001-0416

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are anticipated or unpatentable under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 112. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

I. IN THE DRAWINGS

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for containing handwritten reference numbers. The Applicants respectfully submit that formal drawings were submitted on March 26, 2002 to the USPTO. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that the formal drawings do not contain handwritten reference numbers and request the objection be withdrawn. A copy of the previously submitted formal drawings is enclosed to support Applicants' assertion. If the Examiner's review of the file wrapper indicates that the USPTO has failed to receive the previously submitted formal drawings, Applicants will resubmit the formal drawings upon request by the Examiner.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3-5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 3-5 for being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Namely, the Examiner asserts that "the receiving step" in claims 3 and 4 lack sufficient antecedent basis and that claim 5 is missing words and is, therefore, unclear as to what is claimed in the claim. The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3 and 4 depend from independent claim 1 and therefore include all limitations also present in independent claim 1. Claim 1 recites "a receiving step". As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that there is sufficient antecedent basis for dependent claims 3 and 4. Moreover, dependent claim 5 has been amended in response to the Examiner's rejection. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3, 4 and amended claim 5 now fully comply with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112. As such, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. 2001-0416

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Murakawa (US Publication Number 2001/0020273, Published September 6, 2001, hereinafter referred to as "Murakawa".) The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Murakawa teaches a method of virtual private network communications in security gateway apparatus and security gateway apparatus using the same. Murakawa teaches a PC client that sends an IP packet to a security gateway. (See Murakawa, Paragraph [0071].) The security gateway encapsulates the IP packet and sent to a second PC client via VPN. (See *Id.* at [0072] - [0075].)

The Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that Murakawa fails to teach, show or suggest a method of sending a packet from a first IPsec client to a second IPsec client comprising the steps of, receiving at a non-proprietary format tunneling protocol server from the first IPsec client an IPsec packet wrapped in the non-proprietary tunneling format and creating a non-proprietary format tunneling protocol tunnel, as positively claimed by the Applicants' independent claims. For example, Applicants' independent claim 1 positively recites:

1. A method of sending a packet from a first IPsec client to a second IPsec client, comprising the steps of:
 - receiving at a non-proprietary format tunneling protocol server from the first IPsec client an IPsec packet wrapped in the non-proprietary tunneling format;
 - creating a non-proprietary format tunneling protocol tunnel to the second IPsec client through the non-proprietary format tunneling protocol server;
 - establishing a security association between the first and second IPsec clients via the non-proprietary format tunneling protocol server;
 - transmitting the packet through the non-proprietary format tunneling protocol tunnel to the second IPsec client whereby the packet remains unaffected by any address translation or firewall traversal that may occur during transmission. (Emphasis Added.)

The Applicants' invention teaches a method of sending a packet from a first IPsec client to a second IPsec client via a non-proprietary format tunneling protocol server. Specifically, Applicants teach that the non-proprietary format tunneling protocol server receives from the first IPsec client an IPsec packet wrapped in the non-

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. 2001-0416

proprietary tunneling format. In turn, the non-proprietary format tunneling protocol server creates a non-proprietary format tunneling protocol tunnel to the second IPsec client. For example, the IPsec gateway wraps each IPsec packet in a L2TP format for transmission to the L2TP network server. (See Applicants' Specification, Page 4, Lines 1-4.) Then the L2TP server creates a tunnel to a second IPsec client and transmits the wrapped data IPsec packet via the tunnel. (See *Id.* at Lines 5-9.) As such, the combination of wrapping the IPsec packet in a non-proprietary tunneling format and creating a tunnel via non-proprietary format tunneling protocol server allows IPsec packets to bypass devices, such as a Network Address Translation (NAT) device, thereby, avoiding transmission difficulties that arise from sending IPsec packets through such devices. (See *Id.* at Page 2, Lines 13-20.)

Murakawa clearly fails to anticipate the Applicants' invention in several respects. First, Murakawa fails to teach a non-proprietary format tunneling protocol server that is capable of receiving from a first IPsec client an IPsec packet wrapped in the non-proprietary tunneling format. Murakawa only teaches having a first client PC 101, a security gateway 203, and a second client PC 106. (See Murakawa, Figure 1.) Specifically, the security gateway taught by Murakawa and the non-proprietary format tunneling protocol server taught by the Applicants are not the same. Murakawa teaches that the security gateway receives an IP data packet that is not encapsulated. (See Murakawa, Paragraph [0072]; Figure 1.) In contrast, the non-proprietary format tunneling protocol server taught by the Applicants' invention receives an IPsec packet that is already wrapped in the non-proprietary tunneling format. In other words, at best, Murakawa's security gateway 203 can be interpreted as an IPsec client, but it is absolutely not a non-proprietary format tunneling protocol server.

Moreover, Murakawa completely fails to teach, show or suggest the step of creating a non-proprietary format tunneling protocol tunnel via the non-proprietary format tunneling protocol server. (See Applicants' Specification, Page 2, Lines 13-20.) In contrast, Murakawa teaches establishing a single VPN connection and transmitting the encapsulated packet through said single VPN connection. (See Murakawa, Paragraph [0070] and [0075].) Murakawa is completely devoid of any teaching of a tunnel via a non-proprietary format tunneling protocol server. As such, the Applicants

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. 2001-0416

respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is clearly not anticipated by Murakawa.

Furthermore, dependent claims 2-5, depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and recite additional limitations. As such, and for the exact same reason set forth above, the Applicants submit that claims 2-5 are also patentable and not anticipated by Murakawa. As such, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

IV. "NEW" CLAIMS

The Applicants have re-submitted original claims 6-11. The Applicants respectfully submit that these claims were filed with the original application, but somehow have been inadvertently missed by the USPTO. The Applicants have attached a copy of the original postcard sent to the USPTO and the return postcard stamped by the USPTO indicating that there were no missing pages. Specifically, Applicants submitted two pages of claims (i.e., 11 claims) in the original application. As such, the Applicants respectfully request allowance or examination of these claims submitted with the original application. This claim issue was communicated to the Examiner on May 20, 2005 via a telephone conversation.

Furthermore, various claims were amended to correct typographical errors. Such amendments were not made in response to the cited prior art.

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. 2001-0416


Conclusion

Thus, the Applicants submit that all of these claims now fully satisfy the requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 112. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the issuance of a final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

6/2/05
Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702


Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,400
(732) 530-9404